

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Michael Nelson Armstrong, #14956-056, |) | C/A NO. 3:09-1505-CMC-JRM |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | ORDER |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| Warden John R. Owen, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

This matter is before the court on Petitioner's *pro se* application for writ of habeas corpus, filed in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On June 19, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this matter be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process on Respondent. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Petitioner filed objections to the Report on June 30, 2009.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Petitioner's objections, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order. Petitioner's objections contain no argument which convinces this court that the Magistrate Judge erred in his analysis. Therefore, the petition is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
July 1, 2009

C:\Documents and Settings\Kgb07\Local Settings\Temp\notesE1EF34\09-1505 Armstrong v. Owen adopt rr dism 2241 wo svc successive 2255.wpd